

history of whaling deserves a place among the major historical themes represented in the National Park System. The federal designation will also mean a significant boost to the economy of the region as more and more visitors come to New Bedford to learn about its extraordinary history."

The bill authorizes an estimated \$4 million over the next five years in federal funds for the Park, with a ceiling of \$2 million on the amount of federal funds that can be used for construction and rehabilitation.

In addition, in an innovative feature of the bill that may become a model for future park funding in the era of limited federal resources, the bill requires a 1-to-1 private-sector match for construction and rehabilitation funds, and a 4-to-1 private-sector match for other projects related to the Park. The goals of the Park can be achieved with modest federal funding, because substantial local resources have already been dedicated in New Bedford, and the community has a strong commitment to maintain these efforts in years to come.

Passage of this bill will make the New Bedford National Historical Park one of only a handful of new national parks to be approved by the Senate in the current Congress. In this era of limited federal resources, Congress is rightly skeptical of new park proposals, but the designation of New Bedford is highly appropriate.

New Bedford won early renown for its whaling expeditions in the Atlantic, and later became a key base for whaling voyages to the Arctic. The whaling industry became so prosperous that by the mid-1800s, New Bedford was the wealthiest city, per capita, in the world.

The Whaling National Historical Park will preserve and restore dozens of New Bedford's historic buildings, which are being restored to appear as they did in the whaling industry's heyday.

The Park will include the Seamen's Bethel—the church in "Moby Dick" where Ishmael heard Father Mapple offer prayers for sailors before setting out to sea. It will also encompass the restored, century-old National Historic Landmark vessel "Ernestina," the oldest Grand Banks schooner in existence, which is now moored in New Bedford's port.

The crown jewel of the Park will be the Whaling Museum, which houses the world's premier whaling archives and art collection. The library contains thousands of ship logs, charts, maps, photos and other records that document the history of whaling in America. The museum also houses a half-size model of the whaling bark "Lagoda," which can be boarded by visitors.

60,000 visitors from the United States and over 40 foreign countries come to the museum each year and participate in its programs. It also receives thousands of requests for information from historians, scientists, educators, photographers, and museum professionals.

The Whaling National Historical Park has been endorsed by numerous national organizations, including the American Institute of Architects, the American Museum Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Melville Society, the New England Council, and the Portuguese American Leadership Council of the United States.

We have worked closely on this bill with Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, Senate Democratic Leader Tom Daschle, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Frank Murkowski, and Senate Parks Subcommittee Chairman Ben Nighthorse Campbell, and we commend them for their assistance and support.

We also commend the tireless dedication of the business community and citizens of New

Bedford and their deep commitment to make this Park a reality. We have also worked very closely with Congressmen Barney Frank and Peter Blute of Massachusetts. Their effective work in the House of Representatives laid the best possible groundwork for today's successful Senate action.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any votes ordered with respect to S. 1664 occur beginning at 2:40 p.m. today, with the first vote being 15 minutes in length and any stacked votes in sequence be limited to 10 minutes, with 2 minutes for debate, to be equally divided, between each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I further ask that any votes remaining to be disposed of at 3:45 p.m. today be further postponed, to begin at 5:30 p.m. in the order in which they were debated and under the same time restraints as mentioned above.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank my colleagues. That will enable us to have final passage of this bill soon after the last amendment is presented. The gap there is because the Senators Chafee-Breaux bipartisan budget group will be at the White House. We thank them for that accommodation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3853 AND 3854, EN BLOC

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Simpson amendment, earlier presented today, be the order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have cleared these amendments with our side of the aisle. Senator KENNEDY has cleared them with his side of the aisle. I urge adoption of the amendments, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to, en bloc.

The amendments (No. 3853 and 3854) were agreed to, en bloc.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO S. SGT. RUBEN RIVERS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if you happened to have read the current edition of U.S. News & World Report, there is a front page story about some very heroic people. One of those persons is from Oklahoma.

Many years ago, back in 1944, when we were trying to push the Germans out of France and the Alsace-Lorraine area, it was the 761st Tank Battalion that was sent over to try to remove, to extract the Germans from that area.

There is one thing that was unique about the 761st Tank Battalion. All of the soldiers in that battalion were black. They called them the "Black Panthers."

One of the bright young soldiers was a staff sergeant by the name of Ruben Rivers. Ruben Rivers was born in Tecumseh, OK, a very quiet, soft-spoken person, the kind who everybody liked. When he went into the service, his desire was to see combat. Back then, even though we had 1.2 million blacks serving in World War II, less than half of them saw combat, and not one of them got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in spite of the fact that they had performed all kind of heroic acts.

Back in 1990, I was serving over in the House, and it was called to my attention by some surviving members of his family some of the things that he had done. When I heard this story, I called his commander, whose name is Capt. David Williams, retired, who was getting quite elderly, and I asked him to verify the story. This is what Ruben Rivers had done.

He was a tank driver. He had won a Silver Star by walking through a minefield and putting a chain on fallen chains and backing out with this tank to detonate all of the mines, taking great personal risk in doing this.

A few weeks later—it was November 14, 1944—Ruben Rivers was driving the lead tank, as he always wanted to do. He went through a minefield in order to detonate the mines so that the 761st Tank Battalion Group A could get through.

When he did this, he went over several mines. One mine went off, and it blew up the undercarriage of his tank and severely wounded Ruben Rivers. In fact, the bone in his right leg was penetrated all the way through. You could see the shiny white bone.

Of course, Captain Williams came over, and he, with the medic, tried to extract him and said, "Take the morphine. You have done enough for America. We're sending you back." He said, "No, my job isn't done yet." He got out of the tank and got in another tank, hobbling over with some help, with one leg, got on the turret and went out into the clearing. The Germans surrounded them from the north. They had our tank battalion completely pinned down where they could not penetrate. Ruben Rivers, in order to find out where they were, drew fire from them. He drove this tank out into the opening. All of them fired, and we were able to go in with our artillery and wipe out the German tank battalion. Of course, Ruben Rivers was dead.

Right after that Capt. David Williams went to the Army and put him up for the Congressional Medal of Honor. I will not go into detail as to what some of the responses were, but they kind of laughed. They said, "Well, I don't think that's going to happen." In fact, the paperwork mysteriously disappeared, not once, but twice, so that nobody had the record on record of Ruben Rivers.

Capt. David Williams, as I mentioned, is getting quite elderly. He said, "I'm going to live long enough to see that Ruben Rivers is posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor."

Back in 1990, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives and told the same story I am telling today, except in perhaps a little more detail, to waive the statute of limitations past 1952 so the President could make that award. The medal has to come from the President of the United States. Then-President George Bush said he would do it, after he had read about the case. But I was unable to get it passed.

I tried it again in 1991, 1992; and until finally in 1995 the Army said, "If you don't introduce any more, we'll go ahead and conduct a study of blacks in the military in World War II to see if any of them had been deserving of the Congressional Medal of Honor who had not received it only because they were black."

That report, I am very happy to say, has come out just a few days ago. They have nominated seven blacks—one is still living today—to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. The President of the United States, Bill Clinton, had said whoever they recommend, he would go ahead and allow them to receive that medal—their families to receive it. So that is exactly what is going to happen. So, I am very happy to say—we hear a lot of negative things that are going on—that something wonderful has happened. A great Oklahoman from Tecumseh, OK, will be awarded posthumously the highest honor to be given for valor in battle, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to withhold?

Mr. INHOFE. Yes, I withhold my request.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY AND WHAT PEOPLE WANT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have a lot of conversation going on around the country these days about the economy and what it is people want to have happen and what it is people are searching for in terms of the Federal approach to the economy.

I will suggest several guideposts that I think we need to follow when we talk about the economy. If I may, Mr. President, I want to put them in terms of the individual lives and the individual economies of each American.

I think the American people want to do three things with their economy. No. 1, they want to earn more. That is a fairly natural thing. I think we all identify with that. We want to earn more. Then we want to keep more, hang on to more of what it is we do earn by the sweat of our brow. Then we do that, earn more, keep more so that we can do more, not just to pile up the money somewhere, but to use it to do things with.

Let me give you some examples on these ideas, Mr. President. First, earning more. That comes as a function in our economy of the growth of the economy. We want to earn more because the economy is growing, not because we are taking it away from somebody else—I earn more because you earn less; we don't want that kind of approach—but growth, more jobs, more economic activity is the way we earn more.

In my home State of Utah, we are currently enjoying a tremendous economic boom. More growth is occurring, and, as a result, perhaps the sweetest result for most people's ears, is that now in Utah jobs are plentiful. People can find work in Utah, whereas as recently as a dozen years ago, it was very tough to find a job. But as the economy grows, jobs are available and everyone can earn more, keeping more.

I will talk again about my own experience in Utah. In our company, which was an S corporation—I know a lot of people turn off because this sounds technical—but an S corporation is simply, for tax purposes, a corporation where the earnings are allowed to flow through to the tax returns of the owners. So the corporation does not pay any tax. The whole earnings of the corporation are added on to the individual tax returns of the owners. The owners pay the taxes.

When we had a corporation like that in Utah, we were paying a top tax rate of 28 percent during the 1980's. Today, that tax rate, as a result of the tax in-

creases that have occurred, is 42 percent, a 50 percent increase, Mr. President, that occurred over a period of just 3 years. So even though we may have been earning more, we were not able to keep even as much as we had been earning. We were not able to keep that which was coming in to our company, and our activity, with the taxes going up, as I say, from 28 percent to 42 percent.

Why is it important if we are earning more to keep more? Back in the days when we could keep all but 28 percent of that, we could do more. We were able to create jobs. The particular company that I was involved with, when I became involved, had just four employees. We were creating jobs for four people. I was the fifth one hired and put on the payroll.

Today that company employs close to 3,000 people. We earned more because we were in a growth industry. We were able to keep more because the tax rate was at 28 percent. We were able to do more with the money that we kept in the form of creating job security and a better lifestyle for nearly 3,000 people, new jobs created that did not exist before.

One point I think we need to understand very clearly as we talk about the jobs that were created during the Reagan years—President Clinton talks about the jobs that have been created during his administration—we must understand that the Federal Government does not create a single job. No government does. The only government jobs that are there are those jobs that are created to be paid for with somebody else's taxes. All of the new jobs that represent earning more and growth come out of the private sector.

All the Federal Government can do is create an atmosphere in which that growth can take place. It cannot, by passing a law, create a job, unless, as I said, it takes somebody's tax money to create a job. Your salary, Mr. President, my salary, the salary of everyone here comes out of somebody else's taxes. All Government jobs do.

So the Government should focus on creating an environment, an atmosphere, where the entrepreneurial energy of private Americans can create growth. Then the Government should say, "Let's look at our own expenditures to hold down the spending on the Government side so that those who are creating the jobs, allowing people to earn more, are allowed to keep more of that which they create." If we do that, we know from experience they will then do more with the money they are allowed to keep that will benefit the economy and all Americans as a whole.

But what it really comes down to, Mr. President, is this. It is a question of trust. Does the Government trust its citizens to go out in the economy and take care of their own problems? Does the Government trust its citizens to hang on to the money that they earn and make their own decisions with it? Does the Government trust its citizens